UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/692,634 | 10/24/2003 | Daniel P. Brown | CS21907RA | 8650 |

20280 7590 02/09/2006

MOTOROLA INC
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45
ROOM AS437
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| HUANG, WEN WU | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2682 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/692,634 | BROWN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Wen W. Huang | 2682 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grube et al. (US. 6,885,874 B2; hereinafter "Grube") in view of Diaz et al. (US. 6,675,006 B1; hereinafter "Diaz")

The applied reference has a common assignee, Motorola Inc., with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing

that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See Grube, MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Regarding **claim 1**, Grube teaches a method for a wireless communication device to provide information about an incident (see Grube, col. 7, lines 28-30), the method comprising:

detecting an activation input associated with an incident event (see Grube, col. 7,lines 40-41 and col. 6, lines 8-9);

scanning for at least one remote device (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-14);

coordinating (see Grube, col. 8, lines 46-48) collection of data with the at least one remote device (see Grube, col. 8, lines 60-63);

recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Grube, col. 6, lines 33-35); and

transmitting the recorded data to a designated location (see Grube, col. 5, lines 36-37).

However, Grube fails to teach that the data being obtained by at least one video sensor of the at least one remote device.

But, Diaz teaches a method for a wireless communication device to provide information about an incident wherein the data being obtained by at least one video sensor of the at least one remote device (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Grube with the teaching of Diaz in order to exchange video information (see Grube, col. 5, lines 26-29) in a talk group.

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 1, wherein coordinating collection of data with the at least one remote device includes informing the at least one remote device about the designated location (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-14).

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving authorization to utilize data obtained by the at least one remote device (see Grube, col. 8, lines 30-35 and col. 15, lines 22-24).

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising identifying subject matter of the incident event based on the activation input (see Grube, col. 9, lines 29-31 and 47-48).

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

retrieving previously recorded data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Grube, col. 9, lines 57-60); and

transmitting the previously recorded data to the designated location (see Grube, col. 12, lines 8-11).

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 1, wherein:

scanning for the at least one remote device including scanning via a wireless local area network (see Grube, col. 6, line 42); and

transmitting the recorded data to a designated location includes transmitting via a cellular communication system (see Grube, col. 4, lines 53-55).

Regarding **claim 7**, Grube teaches a method for a wireless communication device to provide information about an incident (see Grube, col. 7, lines 28-30), the method comprising:

detecting, from a remote device, a request signal associated with an incident event (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-14);

receiving information from the remote device about a designated location (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-14);

recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Grube, col. 6, lines 33-35); and

transmitting the recorded data to the designated location (see Grube, col. 13, lines 7-10).

However, Grube fails to teach that the data being obtained by at least one video sensor.

But, Diaz teaches a method for a wireless communication device to provide information about an incident wherein the data being obtained by at least one video sensor (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Grube with the teaching of Diaz in order to exchange video information (see Grube, col. 5, lines 26-29) in a talk group.

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising identifying subject matter of the incident event based on audio characteristics received from the remote device (see Grube, col. 9, line 45-48).

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising providing authorization to the remote device to utilize the recorded data (see Grube, col. 13, lines 24-25).

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising:

identifying subject matter of the incident event based on the request signal (see Grube, col. 7, lines 59-62); and

requesting more information from the remote device if the subject matter cannot be clearly identified (see Grube, col. 9, lines 45-48; by using a voice channel/PTT communication the operation identify the reason for the desire to initiate a service).

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising:

retrieving previously recorded data relating to the subject matter of the incident event (see Grube, col. 9, lines 57-60); and

transmitting the previously recorded data to the designated location (see Grube, col. 12, lines 8-11).

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 7, wherein transmitting the recorded data to a designated location includes transmitting via a wireless communication system (see Grube, col. 4, lines 53-55).

Regarding **claim 13**, Grube also teaches a method of a central authority for receiving information about an incident from at least one remote device, the method comprising:

receiving, from a remote device, incident information associated with an incident event (see Grube, col. 13, lines 7-10);

comparing the incident information to previously received information to identify at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Grube, col. 13, lines 49-50), the at least one portion including information received from a device other than the remote device (see Grube, col. 13, lines 52-55); and

correlate the incident information with the at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Grube, col. 13, lines 58-60).

However, Grube fails to teach that the incident information being been obtained by at least one video sensor of the remote device.

But, Diaz teaches a method for receiving information about an incident from at least one remote device wherein the incident information being been obtained by at least one video sensor of the remote device (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Grube with the teaching of Diaz in order to exchange video information (see Grube, col. 5, lines 26-29) in a talk group.

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising:

determine whether other information sources are available (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-17); and

request information from the other information sources that are available (see Grube, col. 8, lines 36-41).

Regarding **claim 15**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising reconstructing the incident event based on the incident information and the at least one portion of the previously received information that relates to the incident information (see Grube, col. 11, lines 49-52, and col. 17, lines 19-21).

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising:

identify other devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Grube, col. 14, lines 49-53); and

alert any devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Grube, col. 7, lines 11-19).

Regarding **claim 17**, Grube teaches a system for processing information about an incident comprising:

a first wireless communication device (see Grube, fig. 1, component 105) including a first short-range transceiver (see Grube, fig. 1, component 116; col. 5, lines

42-44 and col. 6, line 42) to transmit a request signal (see Grube, col. 5, lines 31-33) and a first media sensor to collect data relating to an incident event (see Grube, fig. 1, components 124 and 126) in response to a user activation input (see Grube, fig. 1, component 122; col. 6, lines 8-9);

a second wireless communication device (see Grube, fig. 1, component 111) including a second short-range transceiver (see Grube, fig. 1, component 116; col. 5, lines 42-44 and col. 6, line 42) to receive the request signal (see Grube, col. 5, lines 31-33) and a second media sensor to collect data relating to the incident event (see Grube, fig. 1, components 124 and 126) in response to the request signal (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-14 and 39-41); and

a central authority (see Grube, fig. 1, component 101) configured to receive the data collected by the first and second wireless communication devices relating to the incident event (see Grube, col. 13, lines 7-10) and performing an action in response to receiving the data (see Grube, col. 8, lines 46-54).

However, Grube fails to teach that said first and second media sensors are a first video sensor and a second video sensor.

But, Diaz teaches a wireless communication device including a video sensor to collect data relating to the incident event (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Grube with the teaching of

Diaz in order to exchange video information (see Grube, col. 5, lines 26-29) in a talk group.

Regarding **claim 18**. the combination of Grube and Diaz teaches the system of claim 17, further comprising a local server having (see Grube, fig. 1,component 106) a third short-range transceiver (see Grube, fig. 1, component 116) to receive the request signal (see Grube, col. 5, lines 42-45 and col. 6, line 42) and to gather the data collected by the first and second wireless communication devices (see Grube, col. 5, lines 28-30 and col. 8, lines 60-63), the local server configured to forward the gathered data to the central authority (see Grube, col. 8,lines 42-45).

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the first wireless communication device (see Grube, fig. 1, component 105) includes a wireless transceiver (see Grube, fig. 1, component 116) to communicate the data collected by the first video sensor (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45; and see Grube, fig. 1, components 124 and 126; col. 5, lines 28 and 36-37) to the central authority (see Grube, fig. 1, component 101).

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the second wireless communication device (see Grube, fig. 1, component 111) includes a wireless transceiver (see Grube, fig. 1, component 116) to communicate the data collected by the second video sensor (see Diaz, fig. 5,

component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45; and see Grube, fig. 1, components 124 and 126; col. 5, lines 28 and 36-37) to the central authority (see Grube, fig. 1, component 101).

Regarding **claim 21**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein:

the second wireless communication device (see Grube, col. 5 lines 26-27) sends the data collected by the second video sensor (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45) to the first wireless communication device (see Grube, col. 5, lines 28-30) via the first and second short-range transceivers (see Grube, col. 5, lines 42-44 and col. 6, line 42); and

the first wireless communication device includes a wireless transceiver to communicate (see Grube, col. 8, lines 42-45) the data collected by the first and second video sensors (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45; and see Grube, col. 8, lines 60-61) to the central authority (see Grube, fig. 1, component 101).

Regarding **claim 22**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the central authority determines whether other information sources are available (see Grube, col. 8, lines 11-17) and requests information from the other information sources that are available (see Grube, col. 8, lines 36-41).

Regarding **claim 23**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the central authority reconstructs the incident event based on the data collected by at least the first and second video sensors (see Diaz, fig. 5, component 58, and col. 3, lines 34-37 and 44-45; and see Grube, col. 11, lines 49-52, and col. 17, lines 19-21).

Regarding **claim 24**, the combination of Grube and Diaz also teaches the system of claim 17, wherein the central authority identifies other devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Grube, col. 14, lines 49-53) and alerts any devices that may become affected by the incident event (see Grube, col. 7, lines 11-19).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kim (US. 6,278,884 B1) teaches a cell phone with camera in a security alarm system.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen W. Huang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7852. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (571) 272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wwh

2/6/06

LEE NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER